

February 21, 1995 LB 86, 144, 274, 450, 830

Evaluation Committee, excuse me, LBs 450 and LB 86. Gubernatorial appointment, and Senator Elmer would like to print amendments to LB 274. (See pages 795-96 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, the next amendment I have to LB 830 is by Senator Wesely. (Wesely amendment, AM0464, appears on page 796 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Wesely, to open on the amendment.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. This amendment would set a sunset clause on the bill. There is a sunset clause in the committee amendments, but all it says is that the bill would sunset, I believe, after a couple of years if nobody utilizes the tax break. Well, we're obviously anticipating that somebody utilizes a tax break, that's why we're doing it. And so it isn't a true sunset clause in the sense that most of them are, that says that a bill exists for a certain period of time and then it stops, and then we either continue it or we don't. What this amendment says is that in the year January 1, 2000, starting a new century I thought maybe would be appropriate to have a fresh look at this, that we will have the whole bill sunset, but any company that qualifies for benefits under the bill would continue to receive whatever benefits they've contracted for, so that nobody loses anything from this. So if Micron comes in and they've got a 10-year or 15-year obligation from the state, that would be met, it would not cease. But we would not take new recipients of the tax breaks after the year January 1, 2000, unless this Legislature, at some point in the future, extends this act beyond that. This is a very critical point for me and it's one that I hope that this Legislature will adopt. I recall that Senator Vrtiska had a bill, LB 144, that dealt with grants to local communities to help them deal with economic development. That bill, LB 144, had something like \$250,000 in grant monies that were being discussed, and yet we took the step of putting a sunset clause on that bill for \$250,000. What we're talking about here is a much, much greater amount of money. And, in my view, we need a sunset on this as well. By having the sunset, we can move forward, take a look at how this plays out, see what companies qualify, and then evaluate whether or not it's been in the best interest of the state to continue the policy. As I said in the paper on Sunday, I voted for LB 775 and felt that we